DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 204 JC 890 059

AUTHOR Andrews, Hans A.; Licata, Christine M.
TITLE The State of Faculty Evaluation in Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges within the North Central Region, 1988-1989. A Research Study.
INSTITUTION Council of North Central Community and Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Problems; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Merit Rating; Performance Factors; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Rewards; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Tenured Faculty

ABSTRACT

In 1989, a study was conducted of the evaluation practices for tenured faculty used by members of the Council of North Central Community Junior Colleges. Questionnaires were mailed to the vice-president for academic affairs/instructional dean and the head of the faculty union/association at the 305 institutions. Information was solicited concerning the overall status of post-tenure review practices, evaluation outcomes and associated problems, perceptions regarding effectiveness and benefits, and recommendations for improving the evaluation process. Study findings, based on responses from 158 faculty leaders and 199 campus administrators, included the following: (1) at approximately 70% of the responding institutions, a system existed for the formal evaluation of tenured faculty; (2) faculty and administrators agreed that "classroom effectiveness" was the most important criterion in post-tenure evaluation; (3) faculty and administrators disagreed about the outcomes of the evaluation process, with 61% of the administrators reporting the establishment of a plan for professional growth as an outcome, and 62% of the faculty indicating that tenured faculty are left to their own devices to correct weaknesses; (4) 44.2% of the administrators indicated that they had documented between more than 1 and but less than 10 cases of unsatisfactory performance among tenured faculty in the past 5 years; (5) the most common problems associated with post-tenure evaluation were ineffective implementation of developmental plans, lack of a reward system, and inadequately trained evaluators; and (6) 73% of the faculty and 41% of the administrators were uncertain about the effectiveness of their campus's evaluation system. The survey instrument is attached. (AAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303204

The State of Faculty Evaluation in Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges Within the North Central Region

A Research Study by:

Dr. Hans A. Andrews
Illinois Valley Community College
and
Dr. Christine M. Licata
Rochester Institute of Technology

1988-1989
Supported in Part Through
the
Council of North Central
Community Junior Colleges

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. A. Andrews

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SC 890 059

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

States in the Council
of North Central Community
Junior Colleges

Arizona, Arkansas,
Colorado, Illinois,
Indiana, Iowa, Kansas
Michigan, Minnesota,
Missouri, Nebraska,
New Mexico, North Dakota,
Ohio, Oklahoma,
South Dakota,
West Virginia
Wisconsin, and
Wyoming

The State of Faculty Evaluation in Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges Within the North Central Region

ABSTRACT

This study of post-tenure evaluation practices in community, technical, and junior colleges in a 19 state area found 70 percent of the responding institutions to have post-tenure evaluation practices.

Most institutions listed "individual faculty development and improvement" as a major purpose. Rewarding of merit or merit recognition should receive more attention in these evaluation programs according to the respondents.

Faculty leaders and instructional administrators disagreed on the outcomes that were being obtained in regard to how the evaluation results are used.

Post-tenure evaluation effectiveness was put into question by both faculty and administrative respondents. The two major reasons cited for this lack of a sense of effectiveness were: (1) the evaluation pays lip service to faculty development, and (2) it does not provide an effective mechanism to measure competence.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Overview for Study	4
Purpose of Study	6
Methodology	7
Limitations	8
Results	8
Overall State of Post-Tenure Review Practices	8
Outcomes and Associated Problems	12
Perceptions Regarding Effectiveness and Benefit	16
Recommendations	20
Discussion	36
References	39
Appendix A	

The State of Tenured Faculty Evaluation in Community,Technical, and Junior Colleges Within the North Central Region

By
Hans A. Andrews
and
Christine M. Licata

Faculty evaluation as a key process and potent tool to encourage excellence in instructional programs has received scant examination in American community, technical, and junior colleges.

There has been little written, little educational emphasis on effective evaluation given, and few models to follow presented that deal specifically with this important quality control area. University and four-year college researchers have expended virtually no effort researching evaluation processes in community, technical, and junior colleges.

This is not the case in the secondary school sector, however. Secondary schools in America received a large boost from a national study of principals from 152 secondary schools considered to be meritorious (Mangieri and Arnn, Jr., 1985). These individuals gave strength to the concept that "the premise of instructional leadership on the part of principals is not merely an educational myth" (p. 10).

The principals themselves ranked the most important dimensions of their jobs. Those receiving the highest importance were:

1. Instructional supervision
2. Evaluation of teacher performance
3. Curriculum development

While all community, technical, and junior college instructional deans and vice presidents also have these three job responsibilities listed among those they try to accomplish, the outstanding secondary schools in this country place them as the highest priority in their quest for quality and success.

A. Objectives and Need for This Research

The objectives of this research project were to help fill the needs of community, technical, and junior colleges in the 19-state North Central Region of the United States in determining:

1. The state of tenured faculty evaluation practices
2. The perceived effectiveness of such evaluation practices as reported by instructional administrators and faculty leaders
3. How the results of this research project could be used to report to the colleges those practices and evaluation models that are most effective in improving the quality of instruction.

B. Approach

The researchers attempted to obtain a large sample from the over 300 community, technical, and junior colleges in the 19-state North Central Region. Deans and/or vice presidents of instruction and union and faculty association leaders were sent similar questionnaires to complete and return. A sample of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

The two researchers involved in this research project were both nationally recognized researchers on the topic of faculty evaluation at the community, technical, and junior college levels:

1. Dr. Hans A. Andrews is the author of Evaluating for Excellence published by New Forums Press, Inc., Stillwater, Oklahoma. He has served as a resource person for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) in nationally promoted

seminars on faculty evaluation. He has also been a trainer and faculty member for the Council of North Central Community Junior Colleges at their Deans' Academy and Association meetings. Dr. Andrews is Dean of Instruction at Illinois Valley Community College in Illinois.

2. Dr. Christine M. Licata is the author of Post-Tenure Evaluation: Threat or Opportunity? published by ASHE-ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. She has also spoken nationally on the topic of faculty evaluation and conducted a national study of evaluation practices with nine institutions in the League for Innovation in the Community College. Dr. Licata is Assistant Dean/Director of the School of Business Careers with the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at the Rochester Institute of Technology in New York.

C. Results or Benefits Expected

This research project was planned to be comprehensive and attempted to solicit responses from all community, technical, and junior colleges in the North Central Region. It was expected that each of these colleges would gain a better perspective on (1) what is going on in other institutions relative to effective tenured faculty evaluation practices, (2) how instructional and faculty leaders feel about their evaluation systems, and (3) where "model" programs can be found.

Another goal of the researchers was to influence a number of colleges to eventually implement effective faculty evaluation practices by raising this issue, demonstrating the successful upgrading of faculty and instruction that can and does occur, and ultimately encouraging the topic of quality instruction as a critical issue for collegial conversation, professional meetings, and

professional programs geared for instructional leaders throughout the North Central Region and nationally.

Overview for Study

Converging economic, cultural, political and demographic elements in the higher education environment have coalesced recently to create a general clamor for improved quality and accountability on our college campuses. While much attention has been directed to examining effective ways to measure student learning and curricular outcomes, there is reason to believe that equal attention should be placed on examining faculty evaluation and development practices.

Research alerts us to the facts that the percentage of tenured faculty nationwide is high and hovers at about 70 percent (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1985); the modal age of tenured faculty is increasing and by the year 2000 it will average approximately 60; faculty report feeling severely limited in terms of career mobility and are experiencing an erosion of job satisfaction (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1985). In short, faculty seem to be staying at institutions longer but are not experiencing an attendant sense of fulfillment and creative excitement. Such revelations beg the question of how institutional quality will be sustained and nourished if these perceived realities pervade our campuses.

It is against these dynamics that some in the field call for attention to how well we deal with the performance and developmental needs of faculty and, most particularly, with those of tenured faculty (Andrews 1985; Bennett and Chater 1984; Olswang and Fantel 1980-81; Licata 1986, 1987). The National Commission on Higher Education Issues (1982) identified post-tenure evaluation as one of the

most pressing needs facing higher education in the next decade and urged campus administrators to develop appropriate periodic review systems.

How well have we heeded this call? It is difficult to assess because the literature provides scant information on institutional practices and responses to the notion of reviewing tenured faculty. We do know, however, that the majority of those who publicly support such review do so convinced that such review should be of a formative nature aimed at growth and development rather than reprimand or at revocation of tenure (Bennett and Chater 1984, Chait and Ford 1982, Licata 1986, 1987). Notwithstanding, equally vocal and persuasive have been those who oppose such reviews. The reasons for opposition include the belief that the traditional procedures for assessing tenured faculty already in operation on campus (i.e., promotion process, sabbatical determinations, etc.) are satisfactory and that any additional system would bring with it excessive cost, burdensome paperwork and threats to collegiality (AAUP 1983, Moses 1985, Stern 1983).

For the most part, those institutions reporting formative post-tenure review procedures tend to be four-year private, innovative, liberal arts colleges where emphasis is on growth, and where appropriate resources are marshalled to support the developmental needs of faculty. Available data would also suggest that such four-year institutions are the exception rather than the norm (Licata and Dowdall 1988).

Little is known about the status of post-tenure review within the community and technical college sector. One research study conducted with nine member institutions within League for Innovation in the Community College (Licata 1984) found that post-tenure review systems did exist on seven of the nine campuses and that the majority of faculty and administrators on the campuses agreed that such evaluation should occur. Faculty development and improvement surfaced as the main stated purpose of the evaluation in the majority of these institutions. The

data also indicated that there were multiple sources of input to the evaluation. Interestingly, however, when examining the issue of effectiveness, the majority of these institutional respondents expressed uncertainty about the effectiveness of the evaluation in accomplishing its stated purpose. Further questioned, the majority indicated that the system did not provide an effective mechanism to measure competence and paid only lip service to faculty development. So, while the surveyed institutions claimed to have and want post-tenure review, the effectiveness of the evaluation was suspect in terms of its effectiveness in relationship to its purpose.

Purpose of Study

It is evident from the foregoing discussion that the literature on post-tenure faculty review is limited and has not provided much guidance to administrators who must grapple with the complexity involved with the process. The present study sought to broaden the base of available information regarding the general status of post-tenure review within community, technical and junior colleges.

Several questions served as the focus for our investigation regarding overall status. We wished to determine if post-tenure evaluation exists on campuses and for what purposes; who participates in the evaluation and with what frequency is it conducted? We were also interested in what the outcomes of the evaluation are and what problems, if any, are associated with the process. In particular, we looked at whether the evaluation was perceived as effective and if not, what factors contributed to a report of ineffectiveness. Concurrently, we sought to determine if faculty and administrators viewed the process as beneficial to ensuring institutional quality and what suggestions could be rendered for improvement of the process. Discovery of such information helps determine how campus evaluation systems

might be planned and designed to optimize success. Answers to these and similar questions can also suggest directions for further research.

Methodology

Subjects/Procedures

We drew the sample from faculty and administrators in the 305 member colleges in the North Central Region. Basically, we gathered data by mailing a questionnaire to 610 subjects from the member institutions. The geographic expanse of this region includes 19 states: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. An initial letter explaining the study was included with the questionnaire. A reminder postcard was sent approximately two weeks later.

We asked the vice president for academic affairs or instructional dean on each campus as well as the faculty leader (either union or faculty association head) to respond to the questionnaire. We received 357 total responses (58.5 percent) of which 158 (44.3 percent) were from faculty leaders and 199 (55.7 percent) were from the campus administrators. In sum, this represents 199 individual institutions. This response rate is considered quite good for a questionnaire of this type.

Once collected, the data were treated with nonparametric measures to generate simple and relative frequencies which were then used to tabulate the numbers and percentage of responses to each question.

Limitations

While the data collected reflect post-tenure practices of 19 states, one must be careful not to project the same results to all other states and/or parts of the United States.

It should also be noted that a number of questionnaires were returned from community colleges indicating they did not have a tenure system for faculty. The researchers realized too late that these colleges could still have been encouraged to report on their faculty who, while not tenured, have a "continuing contract" system. This oversight may have reduced the total return by 4-6 percent.

Results

The results are organized by the foci of the research questions: (1) What is the overall status of post-tenure evaluation; (2) What are the associated outcomes and problems; (3) What are the perceptions regarding effectiveness and benefit; (4) What suggestions, if any, are given for improvement of the process?

WHAT IS THE OVERALL STATUS OF POST-TENURE REVIEW PRACTICES?

Purpose, Fluency, Input Sources, Evaluative Criteria

Approximately 70 percent of the responding institutions indicated that a system existed on their campus for formal evaluation of tenured faculty. As can be seen in Table 1, both administrators (59 percent) and faculty leaders (55 percent) indicated that the stated primary purpose for this evaluation was to provide a basis for faculty development and improvement, while 29 percent of administrator respondents and 24 percent of faculty leaders indicated that it provided information

needed in making decisions on promotion, retention, dismissal and normal salary increments. Interestingly, when asked what should be the primary purpose,the responses still indicated that faculty development and improvement should be the primary purpose. However, faculty leaders shifted somewhat and selected making merit compensation or merit recognition decisions as the second response choice. It appears that some faculty leaders would like the evaluation to carry merit benefits. This was corroborated also by open-ended statements made by both faculty leaders as well as administrators when asked to recommend changes in their evaluation plan (see page 19 for further discussion of this).

Table 1

What Are the Stated Purposes for Faculty Evaluations?

Criteria Selected	Faculty Responses N = 173		Adminis-tration Responses N = 225	
	Re-sponses	Per-cent	Re-sponses	Per-cent
1. Basis for individual faculty development	102	59.0	140	54.9
2. Making decisions on promotion, retention and dismissal	42	24.3	75	29.4
3. Making merit compensation or merit recognition decisions	16	9.2	29	11.3
4. Other	13	7.5	11	4.3

Table 1 (continued)

What Should Be the Purpose for Faculty Evaluations?

Criteria Selected	Faculty Responses N = 181		Administration Responses N = 287	
	Responses	Percent	Responses	Percent
1. Basis for individual faculty development	111	61.3	141	49.1
2. Making decisions on promotion, retention and dismissal	30	16.6	78	27.2
3. Making merit compensation or merit recognition decisions	35	19.4	59	20.5
4. Other	5	2.8	9	3.2

In 80 percent of the institutions with an evaluation plan, the plan specifies a routine process to be followed. The process outlined includes frequency of the evaluation and the main sources of input.

When asked who participates in the process, data from administrators and faculty surveyed indicate that in about 33 percent of the institutions, student and administrative evaluations are obtained and in another 33 percent, faculty are evaluated only by their administrative supervisors. A combination of student, peer and administrative feedback is reported by only 16 percent of the institutions. Student evaluation alone is noted in only 7 percent of the cases. In terms of frequency of evaluation, approximately 47 percent of the plans specify yearly review and 33 percent require review every three years.

In sum, the results indicate that 146 out of the 199 institutions responding have post-tenure evaluation plans and that the majority of such plans are guided by formative purposes. Only about one-fourth of the institutions indicated summative purposes as part of the review. Yearly reviews seem to be the norm

and input from administrative supervisors (division chairs and/or dean of instruction) and from students appear to form the basis of such reviews in the majority of cases.

Criteria Utilized in Post-tenure Evaluation

Faculty leaders and community college instructional leaders both agree that "classroom effectiveness" is the number one criterion utilized in post-tenure evaluation (see Table 2). This points to in-class evaluation as being highly important in the assessment of classroom effectiveness. This is not surprising because the area of classroom teaching is by far the main job of community college faculty. This differs significantly from faculty at senior colleges and universities where research and publishing often push classroom instruction into third place in terms of job responsibilities and evaluation criteria.

Other criteria selected by both faculty leaders and instructional administrators include: (1) course or curriculum development; (2) contributions to department; (3) campus committee work; (4) innovation in teaching methods; and (5) attendance and reliability. These and other criteria selected are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Criteria Utilized in Post-Tenure Evaluation

Criteria Selected	Number of Faculty Leaders Responses		Number of Instructional Administrative Responses	
	Responses	Rank	Responses	Rank
1. Classroom Effectiveness	98	1	131	1
2. Contribution to Department	71	2	103	3/4
3. Campus Committee Work	70	3	98	5
4. Course or Curriculum Development	67	4	104	2
5. Attendance and Reliability	66	5	93	6
6. Innovation in Teaching Methods	65	6	103	3/4
7. Advising Students	59	7	76	9
8. Availability to Students	53	8	81	8
9. Public Service Activities	52	9	84	7
10. Activity in Professional Society	48	10	72	10

In addition, respondents clearly do not believe that the criteria used for post-tenure evaluation should differ significantly from the criteria used in pre-tenure evaluation.

WHAT ARE THE OUTCOMES AND ASSOCIATED PROBLEMS?

Outcomes of Evaluation

Interestingly, the majority of administrator respondents (61 percent) indicated that the evaluation data are shared with the faculty member and a plan for improvement and/or professional growth is established and supported by institutional resources. Yet, the majority of faculty leaders (62 percent) indicated

that the evaluation is shared, but the faculty member is left to his/her own devices to correct any weaknesses. So, it is clear from Table 3 that disagreement occurs between faculty and administrators regarding what happens as a result of the evaluations.

Table 3

What Happens With Post-Tenure Evaluation

Criteria Selected	Faculty Response N = 124		Administrative Response N = 145	
	Responses	Percent	Responses	Percent
1. Shared with faculty member and left to his/her own devices to improve	77	62.1	49	33.8
2. Shared with faculty member and plan for improvement	35	28.2	89	61.4
3. Other	12	9.7	7	4.2

Unsatisfactory Performance

Instructional administrators were asked how many occurrences in the last five years they had documented of "unsatisfactory performance." Only four (2.9 percent) indicated 10 or more documented occurrences. Sixty-one (44.2 percent) responded that they had documented between one and ten occurrences of unsatisfactory performances. Some 50 (36.29 percent) administrators said they had had one or fewer and 23 (16.7 percent) indicated they had found "none." (See Table 4.)

Table 4

Degree of Occurrence in Unsatisfactory Performance

Criteria Selected	Administrative Response N = 138	
	Number	Percent
1. Ten or more	4	2.9
2. Less than 10 but more than 1	61	44.2
3. 1 or fewer	50	36.2
3. None	23	16.7

The immediate actions reported taken by administrators as a result of the unsatisfactory performance are detailed in Table 5. By far, the establishment of a development plan with the faculty member occurs most frequently and is reported by 75 percent of the respondents.

Table 5

Action Taken for Unsatisfactory Performance

Action Selected	Administrative Response N = 118	
	Number	Percent
1. Development Plan	89	75.4
2. Demotion/Reduction in Salary	1	.9
3. Dismissal	3	2.5
3. Promotion Request Denied	2	1.7
3. No Action	12	10.2
3. Other	11	9.3

Problems

The problems associated with post-tenure evaluation plans receiving the most frequent mention by faculty leaders and administrators were: (1) ineffective implementation of developmental plan; (2) lack of reward system; and (3) evaluators not adequately trained (See Table 6.)

Table 6
Problems With Post-Tenure Evaluation

Criteria Selected	Faculty Response			Administrative Response		
	Number	Rank	Percent	Number	Rank	Percent
1. Ineffective Implementation of Development Plan	61	1	26.0	68	2	24.2
2. Lack of Reward System	56	2	23.8	80	1	28.5
3. Evaluators Not Adequately Trained	42	3	17.9	32	4	11.4
4. Faculty Resistance	19	4	8.1	35	3	12.5
5. Excessive Paperwork	18	5	7.6	25	5	8.9
6. No Problems	16	6	6.8	22	5	7.8
7. Other	23	7	9.8	19		6.7

Respondents were given an opportunity, through an open-ended item, to specify what some of the other problems might be with the evaluation. Problems cited here included: (1) the forms utilized to gather evaluative information need to be examined and improved; (2) evaluation process occurs too frequently; (3) uneven application of criteria occurs; (4) fear of retaliation is present; (5) no faculty development/professional guidance follows evaluation; (6) process does not allow for recognition of high achievers, average achievers and poor achievers; (7) no consequences of process are evident. When all problems noted are taken together, it becomes fairly evident that more work is needed on some campuses to

fortify the process and make it more meaningful. Suggestions for how to accomplish such changes and fortification were made by respondents and will be discussed later. However, it is important to note that the proposed recommended changes suggested by respondents relate directly to the majority of problems identified here with the current processes.

As referenced earlier, the data show a disparity in the responses of administrators versus faculty leaders in terms of what action is taken as a result of the evaluation. The majority of administrators indicated that a development plan is established and supported by the institution; whereas faculty leaders indicated that faculty were left to their own devices. Yet, even administrators join faculty in pointing to ineffective implementation of a development plan and the lack of a reward system for good performers as frequent problems. These are puzzling data because administrators also indicate that when unsatisfactory performance is identified, the strategy employed with most frequency is the development of a plan. One is left to question and wonder whether such plans are effective in light of what we see reported here.

WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS REGARDING EFFECTIVENESS AND BENEFIT?

Perceptions Regarding Effectiveness

The effectiveness of post-tenure evaluation is highly suspect in many of the colleges surveyed. Only two faculty leaders (2 percent) and four instructional administrators (3 percent) ranked such evaluation as very effective. An additional 31 faculty (7 percent) and 81 administrators (56 percent) chose "effective" to describe their evaluation system. Taken together, 59 percent of the administrators, but only 27 percent of the faculty responding, view this evaluation as either very

effective or effective. These figures were offset by 88 faculty (73 percent) and 59 administrators (41 percent) who were "uncertain about effectiveness" or saw their evaluation system as "ineffective." (See Table 7.)

Table 7
Effectiveness of Post-Tenure Evaluation

Criteria Selected	Faculty Response N = 121			Administrative Response N = 144		
	Number	Rank	Percent	Number	Rank	Percent
1. Very Effective	2	4	1.7	4	4	2.8
2. Effectiveness	31	2	25.6	81	1	56.2
3. Uncertain About Effectiveness	60	1	49.6	48	2	33.3
4. Ineffective	28	3	23.1	11	3	7.7

The major reasons given for this uncertainty or ineffectiveness of the post-tenure evaluation plan agreed to by both faculty and administration as seen in Table 8 are:

1. Pays only "lip service" to faculty development.
2. No mechanism to measure competence/incompetence.

Table 8

Major Reason for Uncertainness or Ineffective Evaluation Choices

Criteria Selected	Faculty Response N = 91		Administrative Response N = 59		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
1. Pays only "Lip Service"	31	34.1	17	28.8	48
2. No mechanism to measure competence/incompetence	22	24.2	16	27.0	38
3. Evaluator not adequately trained	14	15.4	1	1.7	15
4. Poor instructors not placed on warning	8	8.8	6	10.2	14
5. Inflexible Evaluation system	2	2.2	2	3.4	4
6. Other	14	15.4	17	28.8	31

Perceptions Regarding Benefit

Faculty leaders were asked how they viewed post-tenure evaluation in terms of its benefits to their own professional development. The results are inconclusive because almost as many respondents are displeased as are pleased. As can be seen in Table 9, about 53 percent viewed it as very beneficial or beneficial, 6 percent as detrimental and 41 percent checked "Other"!

Table 9

Benefit of Evaluation System in Terms of Individual Professional Development

Criteria Selected	Faculty Response N = 120	
	Number	Percent
1. Very Beneficial	5	4.2
2. Beneficial	59	49.2
3. Detrimental	7	5.8
4. Other (Please Specify)	49	40.8

In analyzing the reasons given for checking other, the following pattern emerged in the responses:

Reason	Number of Responses	Percent
Little benefit or value to professional development	11	22.4
No benefit or value to professional development	23	46.9
Neither a benefit nor a detriment to professional development	9	18.5
Other	6	12.2
Total	49	100.0

One can surmise from these data that there are many evaluation systems that do not positively impact on professional development of faculty.

Weeding Out Incompetence/Increasing Faculty Growth

Regarding the question of whether post-tenure evaluation leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty members, the majority of administrators and faculty felt that such evaluation did not, in fact, weed out incompetent faculty members but did agree that it increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.

The majority of respondents felt, however, that the evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty. (See Table 11, page 28, questions 8, 9, 10 and Table 12, page 29, questions 8, 9, 10.)

Summary

Administrators and faculty leaders in the North Central community, technical and junior colleges came across as a group being supportive of good evaluation. They highly supported the "present" and "ideal" use of evaluation as an individual faculty development process outcome.

They were, on the other hand, critical of post-tenure evaluation as not being effective in relationship to its purpose and felt that it somehow should also do a better job in weeding out incompetent faculty. They also seemed to feel there is a lack of individual faculty development follow-up by those charged with such follow-up.

The area of reward systems for faculty was seen as an area highly lacking in present post-tenure evaluation systems. It was selected as the second most serious or neglected area when looking at present problems in post-secondary evaluation.

WHAT RECOMMENDED CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED?

Both administrators and faculty leaders were asked to respond to the following open-ended question: "If you could change post-tenure evaluation plans at your institution, what changes would you make?" All responses were reviewed to determine emergent thematic response categories and to record the frequency with which each recommendation was made. For the most part, faculty and administrators focused their recommendations on evaluation system design, system

implementation and system outcomes. The recommendations generated in rank order (according to frequency) according to these three overall categories include:

Evaluation Design Recommendations

1. Tie evaluation system to faculty development/to a formative purpose.
2. Increase peer involvement/explore classroom visitation as a technique.
3. Enhance student involvement in review through student evaluation of teaching/improve student evaluation instrumentation.
4. Involve faculty in design and establishment of individual professional goals.
5. Lessen importance of student evaluation.
6. Ensure plan is consistent and systematic, decreasing possibility for subjective assessment.
7. Include multiple resources of evaluation input.

Evaluation Implementation Recommendations

1. Provide opportunities for training of evaluators.
2. Decrease frequency of evaluation from yearly to a two to three year cycle.
3. Establish a nonthreatening climate for evaluation.

Evaluation Outcomes Recommendations

1. Provide incentives for excellent performers.
2. Provide adequate resources for faculty development.
3. Make evaluation more effective in retention/dismissal/reward.
4. Monitor results of development plans established as a consequence of the evaluation.

Table 10 displays these recommendations according to overall frequency. On a macro level, it should be noted that the two recommendations that met with most frequent mention were a need for the evaluation to be formative in nature, tied to a faculty development process and a need for the plan to provide merit

incentives for excellent performers. While at a first glance, these may seem to be contradictory recommendations because merit rewards imply a summative evaluation orientation (i.e., making personnel decisions which can include salary or merit reward), and a formative purpose mandates improvement and growth as its primary focus. However, upon closer examination, it seems that faculty leaders and administrators are saying that the system needs to promote development and growth for those in need of it but at the same time provide recognition and incentives for those who consistently perform at a high level. In other words, there needs to be consequences from the evaluation for all performance levels. And taken a step further, that in time, after all measures for improvement and remediation have been made available to those whose performance is unsatisfactory, that some summative consequence should occur. Listen to what selected faculty leaders said on this point:

Table 10

Recommendations for Change

Recommendation*	Frequency of Citation		Total
	Faculty Leader	Administrator	
1. Tie system to faculty development and a formative purpose	12	20	32
2. Provide incentives (merit) for excellent performers	8	17	25
3. Increase peer involvement (include classroom observation)	12 (2)	3 (5)	15 (7)
4. Train evaluators	10	4	14
5. Provide adequate resources for faculty development	7	4	11
6. Enhance student evaluation component/examine adequacy of instrumentation	7	4	11
7. Decrease frequency of evaluation	4	6	10
8. Make evaluation more effective in retention/dismissal/reward	6	5	10
9. Involve faculty in design and establishment of individual goals	2	5	7
10. Ensure systematic plan and consistency	3	3	6
11. Monitor results of development plans	2	4	6
12. Lessen importance of student evaluations	5	14	6
13. Establish nonthreatening climate	5	0	5
14. Include multiple resources of input	0	5	5

*Any recommendation that was cited a total of five or more times is included here.

"I'd provide money for faculty development activities. I'd make sure administrators gave "less than satisfactory" ratings to those who deserved them (that is that administrators did not philosophically and behaviorally oppose giving them). I'd provide funds to give bonuses or other awards to outstanding faculty without reducing funds to pay all competitive salaries."

"I would first fire all administrators who knew little or nothing or cared less about evaluation and quality education and replace with competent people. Then I would create an evaluation system which did the following: Distinguished those minimally competent from those below minimal competence. Provided remediation for the latter group with an outcome that would either ... a) make them competent, or b) permit their legal dismissal. Provide cautionaries enrichment and improvement for all staff according to their needs and desires. Provide adequate funding and resources for this."

"Put some 'teeth' into the plan so incompetent staff could be dismissed. Institution needs to utilize more financial resources for staff development."

"There is a need for faculty input in the evaluation process free of administrative dictates that borders on hidden threats to job security. There is a need for significant reward system for effective educators. Evaluators (administrative) at present evaluate management (paperwork skills) and are not adequately trained to evaluate effective teaching and find the concept of directing or encouraging a professional growth and improvement plan with the instructor as either a 'foreign' concept or unnecessary. Teachers need to be 'an equal partner' in an evaluation process to make the system work (to achieve the stated goals)."

"Link directly to personal and professional development ... provide guidelines for improvement."

"Tie it to merit pay or free sabbatical time to compensate for a job well done. Encourage outstanding conduct; don't make it a time to look at small points to improve. We all can improve. Even the best of us. But if you are planning to use these evaluations tie it to excellence and pay for that excellence. You'd be surprised how quickly the 'sluggards' will come around and without much being said."

".... Utilize results in a meaningful way to let faculty know when they are doing an excellent job and when they need help. Help faculty development on an individual basis; encourage faculty development."

".... more feedback and awards from system."

".... reward the effective faculty member, not the slouchers; not enough distinction."

"Give consequences to the results, both pro and con."

These comments are corroborated by administrators who echoed the following sentiments:

"Tie each to development package that would link with merit awards."

"Fund a reward system for outstanding performance."

"More specific final ratings with recognition for our outstanding faculty."

"Provide greater positive recognition of high achievers so as to encourage others to 'stretch' themselves."

"Improve faculty ability to set objectives that will improve their teaching and improve linkage with college support activities."

"Develop a comprehensive plan ... correlate results to merit pay, promotion, staff development and also demotion, termination, etc."

"Add something to reward outstanding performance above and beyond a salary increase."

"Reward systems for outstanding performance."

"Relate the plan to merit recognition."

"I would implement a probation and dismissal system for those who do not perform adequately."

"The most obvious overall change would be to get the faculty involved in reacting to the procedure and to attempt to formulate a process which they would support. Instead, we go unilaterally along our path with the faculty basically ignoring the process and the product."

"Increase commitment to faculty development both in tenure of time and money. Recognize excellence in some way, sabbatical concept, plans for growth -- tenure means very little at our institution -- everyone gets it if they apply, all are eligible in 7th consecutive year of employment."

"Tie our system with minor revisions to a merit system."

"Implement a better reward system for outstanding performance."

"Would tie recognition and reward to outstanding performance based on a system which would allow discrimination in recognizing varying levels of performance."

Additional Opinions Regarding Post-Tenure Evaluation

In addition to these open-ended comments, an attempt was also made to solicit opinions to twelve statements relative to what the purpose and the outcome of post-tenure evaluation should be. A four-point Likert-type response scale was provided. Tables 11, 12, and 13 show the composite responses to each item for faculty leaders and administrators.

In general faculty and administrators tended to agree with the same seven statements and disagree with the same five statements. What is important here is that this trend for agreement and disagreement reveals further those components of post-tenure evaluation that receive general support. We know from this set of opinion statements that there is strong agreement from all 355 respondents that:

Item 1:	There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation for tenured faculty to assess level of performance and developmental needs.
Item 3:	There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with post-tenure evaluation plan.
Item 6:	There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.
Item 8:	Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.

We also can determine that there is general disagreement that:

Item 4:	Only instructional administrators should evaluate tenured faculty.
Item 5:	Only tenured colleagues should evaluate tenured faculty.
Item 7:	The criteria used to evaluate tenured faculty should differ from the criteria used to evaluate nontenured faculty.

As noted earlier, interestingly, while there is general disagreement that post-tenure evaluation currently leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty, there is general agreement that it should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty

Also of interest is the strong agreement that tenured faculty should welcome periodic assessment of their overall performance.

Table 11

Administrator Opinions Regarding Post-Tenure Evaluation

Administrators	SD		D		A		SA		No Response	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
1. There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation for tenured faculty to assess level of performance and developmental needs.	0	0	0	0	35	20.3	137	79.7	26	198
2. Tenured faculty should welcome periodic assessment of their overall performance.	0	0	2	.1	67	40.0	103	59.9	26	198
3. There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with the post-tenure evaluation plan.	0	0	0	0	48	28.2	122	1.8	28	198
4. Only instructional administrators should evaluate tenured faculty.	48	28.4	75	44.4	30	17.8	16	9.5	25	198
5. Only tenured colleagues should evaluate tenured faculty.	69	41.1	88	52.4	10	5.9	1	.6	30	198
6. There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.	2	1.2	7	4.1	54	31.6	108	63.1	27	198
7. The criteria used to evaluate tenured faculty should differ from criteria used to evaluate nontenured faculty.	33	19.4	88	51.8	39	22.9	10	5.9	28	198
8. Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.	1	.6	6	3.6	112	66.3	50	29.5	29	198
9. Post-tenure evaluation leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	11	6.7	83	50.9	58	35.7	11	6.7	34	197
10. Post-tenure evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	1	.6	27	16.3	87	52.4	51	30.7	31	197
11. Growth contracts (i.e., individual work plans mutually agreed upon between faculty and supervisor) should be the primary basis for evaluation of tenured faculty in community colleges.	8	4.8	37	22.3	94	56.6	27	16.3	32	197
12. By the year 2000, traditional tenure will not longer exist in the majority of community colleges in the United States.	14	8.3	76	46.2	63	37.5	15	9.0	30	197

Table 12

Faculty Opinions Regarding Post-Tenure Evaluation

Faculty	SD		D		A		SA		No Response	Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
1. There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation for tenured faculty to assess level of performance and developmental needs.	1	.8	4	3.1	55	42.3	70	53.8*	27	157
2. Tenured faculty should welcome periodic assessment of their overall performance.	1	.8	3	2.3	65	50.4	60	46.5	28	157
3. There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with the post-tenure evaluation plan.	1	.9	1	.8	49	38.9	75	59.5*	31	157
4. Only instructional administrators should evaluate tenured faculty.	53	40.8	48	36.9	18	13.8	11	8.5	27	157
5. Only tenured colleagues should evaluate tenured faculty.	43	33.3	54	41.9	19	14.7	13	10.1	28	157
6. There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.	3	2.3	2	1.6	56	43.4	68	52.7*	28	157
7. The criteria used to evaluate tenured faculty should differ from criteria used to evaluate nontenured faculty.	25	19.8	54	42.9	39	31.0	8	6.3	31	157
8. Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.	4	3.1	21	16.5	79	62.2	23	18.2	30	157
9. Post-tenure evaluation leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	21	16.9	75	60.5	21	16.9	7	5.7	33	157
10. Post-tenure evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	9	7.1	15	11.8	72	56.7	31	24.4	30	157
11. Growth contracts (i.e., individual work plans mutually agreed upon between faculty and supervisor) should be the primary basis for evaluation of tenured faculty in community colleges.	9	7.0	48	37.5	56	43.8	15	11.7	29	157
12. By the year 2000, traditional tenure will not longer exist in the majority of community colleges in the United States.	18	15.1	56	47.1	36	30.2	9	7.6	38	157

Table 13

Agreement / Disagreement Trends in Terms of Percentage

Item Number	Faculty Leaders SD	D	A	SA	Item Number	Administrators SD	D	A	SA
1			96.1		1			100	
2			96.9		2			99.9	
3			98.4		3			100	
4		77.7			4		72.8		
5		75.2			5		93.5		
6			96.1		6			94.7	
7		62.7			7		71.2		
8			80.4		8			95.8	
9		77.4			9		57.6		
10			81.1		10			83.1	
11			55.5		11			72.9	
12		62.2			12		53.5		

37

38

Summary

It is compelling to note that what emerges through these findings is a close connection and correlation between respondent opinions and institutional practices as reported in responses to certain descriptive question items on the one hand and the changes recommended by faculty and administrators on the other hand. This can be most clearly delineated and noted when one views these data in the following manner as pertains to four general areas: (1) Opinions (refer to questions 1-12 of questionnaire, part II); (2) Institutional Practices (refer to all questions in part I of questionnaire); (3) Problems (refer to question 13 on faculty form of questionnaire and question 17 on administrative form); (4) Changes (refer to open-ended comments received for question 15 on faculty form and question 19 on administrative form).

Area 1:	Need and Purpose of Evaluation
Opinions	1. There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation to assess level of performance and developmental needs. 2. There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with post-tenure evaluation.
Institutional Practices	The majority of campuses surveyed state that post-tenure evaluation occurs in order to provide a basis for individual faculty development and improvement. These same individuals believe this <u>should</u> be the purpose. At the same time, about one-fourth of the faculty also believe that the evaluation should provide a basis for making merit compensation or merit recognition decisions.
Problems Identified	1. Ineffective implementation of a development plan 2. Lack of a reward system 3. Evaluation pays only lip service to faculty development, i.e., there is not institutional commitment of resources to help faculty grow and improve.
Recommended Changes #1 #2 #5 #9	Respondents suggest that institutions need to take action that: • Ties evaluation system to faculty development and to a formative purpose. • Provides incentives (merit for excellent performers) • Provides adequate resources for faculty development • Involves faculty in design and establishment of individual goals.

Area 2:	Input Sources to Evaluation
Opinions	There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.
Institutional Practices	Institutions surveyed indicated that about one-third use student and administrative evaluations only and another third use only administrative evaluation.
Problems Identified	• Evaluators not adequately trained. • Forms used need to be improved.
Recommended Changes #3 #4 #6 #10	• Increase peer involvement / include classroom observation. • Train evaluators. • Enhance student evaluation component; examine adequacy of instrumentation. • Ensure systematic and consistent plan.

Area 3:	Outcome of Evaluation
Opinions	• Post-tenure evaluation does not currently lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty. • Post-tenure evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty. • Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.
Institu-tional Practices	The majority of faculty respondents indicate that after the results of the post-tenure evaluation are shared with the faculty member, he/she is left to own devices to correct any weaknesses or deficiencies.
Problems Identified	Faculty and administrators state that under current plans no consequences are evident.
Recom-mended Changes #8 #5 #9 #11	• Make evaluation more effective in retention/dismissal/reward. • Provide adequate resources for faculty development. • Involve faculty in design and establishment of individual goals. • Monitor results of development plan.

Area 4:	Frequency of Evaluation
Institutional Practices	The majority of campuses surveyed evaluate tenured faculty on a yearly basis.
Problems Identified	Faculty and administrators state that evaluation occurs too frequently.
Recommended Changes #7	• Decrease frequency of evaluation

Discussion

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The data collected support the fact that formal post-tenure evaluation exists in about 70 percent of responding institutions who belong to the North Central Association.
2. Post-tenure evaluation plans, for the most part, specify evaluation at designated time periods. More of the institutions surveyed evaluate on a yearly basis than on any other cycle.
3. The stated purpose for the evaluation is formative and specifies that the evaluation is used as a basis for individual faculty development and improvement. However, increasing attention is being given to the notion that as a part of the purpose, some allowances should be made for rewarding merit.
4. Generally, as evaluation is currently configured, either students and administrators or administrators alone are the key input sources to such evaluation.
5. There is general agreement on the criteria that are used and should be used in post-tenure evaluation. These include assessment of classroom effectiveness, contributions to department, campus committee work, course and curriculum development and attendance and reliability.
6. Faculty leaders and administrators disagree about the outcome of the evaluation. This disagreement surrounds what happens after the results of the evaluation are shared with the faculty member. Faculty indicate that the evaluatee is left to his/her own devices to correct any weaknesses or deficiencies. Administrators, on the other hand, indicate

that a plan for improvement and professional growth is established and supported by institutional resources.

7. There is no clear indication that the current post-tenure evaluation plans are effective. In fact, more faculty and administrators are uncertain about effectiveness or say their plan is ineffective than indicate the opposite to be true.
8. The two major reasons given for this ineffectiveness are that the evaluation pays lip service to faculty development and does not provide an effective mechanism to measure competence.
9. There are some major additional problems associated with current evaluation practices which boil down to: (1) ineffective implementation of a faculty development plan to complement post-tenure evaluation; (2) a lack of a significant reward system for outstanding performance; and (3) poor or incompetent faculty members are not adequately identified and weeded out.
10. Faculty and administrators generally agree and disagree on the same opinion statements regarding need, purpose and outcomes of post-tenure evaluation.
11. Recommendations for changes in current post-tenure evaluation processes were suggested by administrators and faculty. These suggestions should be taken into consideration by campus leaders who desire to strengthen their current evaluation strategies and by those who are just beginning to put such evaluation into place. A summary of these

recommendations is found in Table 10 (page 23). In general, the respondents recommend institutions to:

1. Tie post-tenure review system to faculty development and a formative purpose.
2. Provide incentives.
3. Increase peer involvement (include classroom observation).
4. Train evaluators.
5. Provide adequate resources for faculty development.
6. Enhance student evaluation component/examine adequacy of instrumentation.
7. Decrease frequency of evaluation.
8. Make evaluation more effective in retention/dismissal/reward.
9. Involve faculty in design and establishment of individual goals.
10. Ensure systematic plan and consistency.
11. Monitor results of development plans.
12. Lessen importance of student evaluations.
13. Establish nonthreatening climate.
14. Include multiple resources of input.

References

American Association of University Professors. November/December 1983. "On Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty." Academe 69: 1a-14a.

Andrews, Hans. 1985. Evaluating for Excellence. Stillwater, Okla.: New Forum Press.

Bennett, John B. and Chater, S. S. Spring 1984. "Evaluating the Performance of Tenured Faculty Members." Educational Record 65: 38-41.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1980. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1985. "The Faculty: Deeply Troubled." Change 17: 31-34.

Chait, Richard, and Ford, A. T. 1982. Beyond Traditional Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Licata, Christine M. 1984. "An Investigation of the Status of Post-Tenure Evaluation in Selected Community Colleges in the United States." Ed.D. dissertation. The George Washington University.

Licata, Christine M. 1986. Post-tenure Faculty Evaluation: Threat or Opportunity? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Licata, Christine M. Spring 1988. "The Eye Sees Not Itself." NEA Thought and Action IV: 1, pp. 49-56.

Licata, Christine M. and Dowdall, Jean A. June 1988. "Looking Back and Ahead at Post-Tenure Evaluation: Ways to Do It, If at All." Unpublished research findings presented at American Association of University Administrators National Assembly XVII, Chicago, Illinois.

Mangieri, J. N. and Arrn, Jr., J. W. 1985. "Excellent Schools: The Leadership Function of Principals." American Education, 21(3). 8-10.

Moses, Ingrid. 1985. "What Academics Think about Regular Reviews of Performance." Australian Universities Review 28 (1): 34-40.

Olswang, Steven G., and Fantel, J. I. 1980-81. "Tenure and Periodic Performance Review: Compatible Legal and Administrative Principles" Journal of College and University Law 7: 1-30.

Stern, Carol S. November/December 1983. "Remarks" Academe 69: 12a-13a.

Illinois Valley COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2578 E. 350TH ROAD, OGLESBY, ILLINOIS 61348-1099
TELEPHONE: 815-224-2720

October 28, 1987

Dear Instructional Leader:

Attention: Dean or Vice President of Instruction

You have probably noticed recently a growing controversy over whether tenured faculty should be subject to periodic reviews of their performance. Obviously, consideration of the issues involved will be more productive if more is known about existing policies, procedures and attitudes.

The Council of North Central Community Junior Colleges and the North Central Association has concurred and with their encouragement and support, we are conducting a study to investigate the status of post-tenure evaluation in the two-year institutions of this region.

You have been selected to participate in our study. Enclosed are two copies of our response questionnaire. You, as the instructional leader should complete one copy. The other copy, with the cover letter, should be given to your faculty leader, faculty president, or union leader. Each of your replies may be returned in the separate postage-paid envelopes.

Please be assured that all responses will remain anonymous.

We would appreciate having your returns by November 13, 1987. Knowing the demands on your time, we thank you in advance for your participation. Your input on this evaluation issue is important to our research and we hope to hear from you.

Sincerely,

Hans A. Andrews, Ed.D.
Dean of Instruction
Illinois Valley Community College

Christine M. Licata, Ed.D.
Assistant Dean/Director
School of Business Careers
Rochester Institute of Technology/
National Technical Institute for
the Deaf

Enclosures: 4

Administrator
(Dean or V.P.) Copy

POST-TENURE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (ADMINISTRATORS)

There are three parts to this questionnaire. Please answer every question in each part, unless otherwise instructed.

PART 1: **Directions: Please respond to each question by placing a checkmark (√) in the appropriate space or by providing the appropriate information where needed**

1. **What is your current position?** *(Check one)*
   _____ 1. Instructional Dean
   _____ 2. Associate/Assistant Dean
   _____ 3. Department Chairperson
   _____ 4. Other *(please specify)*
   _____
   _____

2. **What is your current tenure status as an administrator?** *(Check one)*
   _____ 1. Tenured
   _____ 2. Non-tenured
   _____ 3. Administrative rank does not carry tenure.

3. **Are you tenured as a faculty member on your campus?**
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

QUESTIONS 4-19 refer to EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

4. **Does a formal plan exist at your institution for evaluation of tenured faculty (i.e., a post-tenure evaluation plan)?**
   _____ Yes (proceed to question 6)
   _____ No (proceed to question 5)

5. **If you answered NO to question 4, is your department, division or campus planning to develop a formal procedure to evaluate tenured faculty?**
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No } **STOP! PROCEED TO PAGE 4, PART 2 OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

6. **Listed below are several purposes for faculty evaluation. Check statements which best describe the stated primary purpose(s) at your institution for evaluation of tenured faculty, i.e., post-tenure evaluation.** *(Check one or more)*
   _____ 1. To provide information needed in making decisions on promotion, retention, dismissal and normal salary increments
   _____ 2. To provide information needed in making merit compensation decisions
   _____ 3. To provide information needed in making merit recognition decisions *(i.e., award of sabbatical, special travel stipend, etc.)*
   _____ 4. To provide a basis for individual faculty development and improvement
   _____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____
   _____

7. **In question 6, we asked you to indicate the primary stated purpose for evaluation of tenured faculty at your institution. Now, please indicate what, in your opinion, should be the primary purpose(s) for evaluation of tenured faculty.** *(Check one or more)*
   _____ 1. To provide information needed in making decisions on promotion, retention, dismissal and normal salary increments
   _____ 2. To provide information needed in making merit compensation decisions
   _____ 3. To provide information needed in making merit recognition decisions *(i.e., award of sabbatical, special travel stipend, etc.)*
   _____ 4. To provide a basis for individual faculty development and improvement
   _____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____
   _____

8. In your opinion, to what extent is *post-tenure* evaluation effective in accomplishing the purpose established for it at your institution?

_____ 1. Very effective (proceed to question 10)
_____ 2. Effective (proceed to question 10)
_____ 3. Uncertain about effectiveness
_____ 4. Ineffective

9. If you checked UNCERTAIN or INEFFECTIVE for question 8, what do you consider to be the major reason for this? *(Check only one)*

_____ 1. It is an inflexible evaluation system, not allowing room for individual interests.
_____ 2. It does not provide an effective mechanism to measure competence and incompetence.
_____ 3. It pays only lip service to faculty development, i.e., there is not institutional commitment of resources to help faculty improve or grow professionally.
_____ 4. Evaluators are not trained adequately.
_____ 5. Poor instructors are not placed on warning or released.
_____ 6. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

10. Who within your institution formally participates in the evaluation of tenured faculty? *(Check all that apply)*

_____ 1. Student evaluations only
_____ 2. Peer evaluation (faculty evaluating faculty)
_____ 3. Faculty evaluated by administrative supervisors (division chairs and/or dean of instruction)
_____ 4. Student and peer combination
_____ 5. Student and administrative combination
_____ 6. Peer and administrative combination
_____ 7. Student, peer and administrative combination

11. How often are *tenured* faculty evaluated at your institution?

_____ 1. Yearly
_____ 2. Every 2 years
_____ 3. Every 3 years
_____ 4. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

12. How is evaluation of *tenured* faculty initiated at your institution?

_____ 1. A formal plan specifies routine evaluation at designated time intervals
_____ 2. Faculty member initiates the evaluation
_____ 3. Supervisor initiates the evaluation
_____ 4. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

13. How often are *non-tenured* faculty evaluated at your institution?

_____ 1. Yearly
_____ 2. Every 2 years
_____ 3. Every 3 years
_____ 4. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

14. What is actually done with the data generated by the post-tenure evaluation process at your institution? *(Check one only)*

_____ 1. Post-tenure evaluation is shared with evaluated faculty member and a plan for improvement and/or professional growth is established and supported by institutional resources.
_____ 2. Post-tenure evaluation is shared with evaluated faculty member and the evaluated faculty member is left to his/her own devices to correct any weaknesses or deficiencies.
_____ 3. Post-tenure evaluation is not shared with evaluated faculty member; information is used by administration to make personnel decisions.
_____ 4. Post-tenure evaluation is not shared with evaluated faculty member; no follow up or institutional use is apparent.
_____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

15. With what degree of occurrence have evaluations of tenured faculty in your department/division/unit resulted in unsatisfactory performance ratings over the last five years?

_____ 1. 10% or more of evaluations have been unsatisfactory.
_____ 2. Less than 10% but more than 1% of the evaluations have been unsatisfactory.
_____ 3. 1% or fewer of the evaluations have been unsatisfactory.
_____ 4. None have been unsatisfactory. *(Proceed to question 17)*

16. What immediate action was taken at your institution as a result of the unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluations cited in question 15? *(Check only one)*

_____ 1. Development plan established with faculty member to remediate deficiencies
_____ 2. Demotion/reduction in salary
_____ 3. Dismissal
_____ 4. Promotion request denied
_____ 5. No action
_____ 6. Other *(please specify)* _____
_____

17. Which of the following do you regard as problems associated with *post-tenure* evaluation at your institution? *(Check all that apply)*

_____ 1. No problems; the post-tenure evaluation system works effectively
_____ 2. Excessive paperwork
_____ 3. Faculty resistance
_____ 4. Ineffective implementation of faculty development plan to complement post-tenure evaluation
_____ 5. Lack of a significant reward system for outstanding performance
_____ 6. Evaluators are not adequately trained
_____ 7. Other *(please specify)* _____
_____

18. Has there been a change in your college's priority for faculty evaluation during the past two years?

_____ 1. Yes *(if yes, state what the change has been)* _____
_____
_____
_____ 2. No

19. If you could change post-tenure evaluation plans at your institution, what changes would you make?

_____
_____
_____
_____

20. Would you please *send a copy of your post-tenure evaluation policy* to us with this questionnaire.

PART 2: OPINIONS REGARDING POST-TENURE EVALUATION
Directions: Please read each of the following statements. Using the scale below, circle the letters that most closely reflect your reaction to each statement:
SD - Strongly Disagree / D - Disagree / A - Agree / SA - Strongly Agree

1.	There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation for tenured faculty to assess level of performance and developmental needs.	SD	D	A	SA
2.	Tenured faculty should welcome periodic assessment of their overall performance.	SD	D	A	SA
3.	There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with the post-tenure evaluation plan.	SD	D	A	SA
4.	Only instructional administrators should evaluate tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
5.	Only tenured colleagues should evaluate tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
6.	There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.	SD	D	A	SA
7.	The criteria used to evaluate tenured faculty should differ from criteria used to evaluate non-tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
8.	Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.	SD	D	A	SA
9.	Post-tenure evaluation leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
10.	Post-tenure evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
11.	Growth contracts (i.e., individual work plans mutually agreed upon between faculty and supervisor) should be the primary basis for evaluation of tenured faculty in community colleges.	SD	D	A	SA
12.	By the year 2000, traditional tenure will no longer exist in the majority of community colleges in the United States.	SD	D	A	SA

PART 3: CRITERIA UTILIZED IN POST-TENURE EVALUATION
Directions: Listed below are 19 criteria normally used in faculty evaluation.
a) If you currently have a post-tenure evaluation process at your institution, follow Steps 1, 2, and 3.
b) If you currently do NOT have a post-tenure evaluation process at your institution, DO NOT COMPLETE this part of the questionnaire.

	STEP 1 Check (✓) each criterion currently used in post-tenure evaluation at your institution. Add any criterion to the list in the space provided at the bottom.	STEP 2 For each criterion you checked in Step 1, use the following number scale to indicate the amount of influence it carries. Put the appropriate number in the space provided below. 1 (Minor influence) 2 3 (Moderate influence) 4 5 (Major influence)	STEP 3 Check (✓) the five criteria you would prefer to be the most influential in post-tenure evaluation at your institution
____	1. Classroom Effectiveness		
____	2. Advising Students.		
____	3. Campus Committee Work		
____	4. Personality		
____	5. Research		
____	6. Activity in Local, State or National Professional Society		
____	7. Publication		
____	8. Public or Community Service Activities		
____	9. Consultation in Field		
____	10. Competing Job Offers		
____	11. Availability to Students Outside of Required Office Hours		
____	12. Contributions to Department/Division .		
____	13. Course or Curriculum Development ..		
____	14. Innovation in Teaching Methods and Materials		
____	15. Attendance and Reliability		
____	16. Accumulation of Graduate Credits ...		
____	17. Working Toward Doctorate		
____	18. Teaching Community Service or Off-Campus Courses		
____	19. Personal Life Style		
OTHER:			
____	20. _____		
____	21. _____		
____	22. _____		

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the attached self-addressed envelope

Licata C -163A# #

Illinois Valley COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2578 E. 350TH ROAD, OGLESBY, ILLINOIS 61348-1099
TELEPHONE: 815-224-2720

October 28, 1987

Dear Faculty Leader:

We have asked your Dean or Vice President of Instruction to involve you in our very important study. The attached questionnaire should be completed and returned to us by November 13, 1987.

You have probably noticed recently a growing controversy over whether tenured faculty should be subject to periodic reviews of their performance. Obviously, consideration of the issues involved will be more productive if more is known about existing policies, procedures and attitudes.

The Council of North Central Community Junior Colleges and the North Central Association have concurred and with their encouragement and support, we are conducting this study to investigate the status of post-tenure evaluation in the two-year institutions of this region.

Please be assured that all responses will remain anonymous.

Your input on this evaluation issue is important to our research and we hope to hear from you. Please use the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Thank you in advance for your time and assistance!

Sincerely,

Hans A. Andrews, Ed.D.
Dean of Instruction
Illinois Valley Community College

Christine M. Licata, Ed.D.
Assistant Dean/Director
School of Business Careers
Rochester Institute of Technology/
National Technical Institute for
the Deaf

Enclosures: 2

POST-TENURE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (FACULTY)

There are three parts to this questionnaire. Please answer every question in each part, unless otherwise instructed.

PART 1: Directions: Please respond to each question by placing a checkmark (√) in the appropriate space or by providing the appropriate information where needed.

1. What is your current rank? *(Check one)*
   _____ 1. Professor
   _____ 2. Associate Professor
   _____ 3. Assistant Professor
   _____ 4. Instructor
   _____ 5. Lecturer
   _____ 6. Other *(please specify)*
   _____
   _____

2. What is your tenure status? *(Check one)*
   _____ 1. Tenured
   _____ 2. Non-tenured *(Proceed to question 4)*

3. If tenured, how long have you been tenured in your present position? *(Check one)*
   _____ 1. Less than 1 year
   _____ 2. 1 to 3 years
   _____ 3. 4 to 6 years
   _____ 4. 7 to 9 years
   _____ 5. 10 years or more

4. If non-tenured, are you currently in a tenure-track position?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

QUESTIONS 5-15 refer to EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

5. Does a formal evaluation plan exist at your institution for *tenured* faculty (i.e., a post-tenure evaluation plan)?
   _____ 1. Yes (proceed to question 6)
   _____ 2. No (proceed to Part 2 of this questionnaire, page 4)
   _____ 3. Other *(please specify)* _____
   _____

6. Listed below are several purposes for faculty evaluation. Check the statement(s) which best describes the *stated* primary purpose at your institution for evaluation of *tenured* faculty, i.e., post-tenure evaluation. *(Check one or more):*
   _____ 1. To provide information needed in making decisions on promotion, retention, dismissal and normal salary increments
   _____ 2. To provide information needed in making merit compensation decisions
   _____ 3. To provide information needed in making merit recognition decisions *(i.e., award of sabbatical, special travel stipend, etc.)*
   _____ 4. To provide a basis for individual faculty development and improvement
   _____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____
   _____

7. In question 6, we asked you to indicate the primary stated purpose for evaluation of tenured faculty at your institution. Now, please indicate what, in your opinion, should be the primary purpose (s) for evaluation of tenured faculty. *(Check one or more)*

_____ 1. To provide information needed in making decisions on promotion, retention, dismissal and normal salary increments
_____ 2. To provide information needed in making merit compensation decisions
_____ 3. To provide information needed in making merit recognition decisions *(i.e., award of sabbatical, special travel stipend, etc.)*
_____ 4. To provide a basis for individual faculty development and improvement
_____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____
_____

8. In your opinion, to what extent is *post-tenure* evaluation effective in accomplishing the purpose established for it at your institution?

_____ 1. Very effective (proceed to question 10)
_____ 2. Effective (proceed to question 10)
_____ 3. Uncertain about effectiveness
_____ 4. Ineffective

9. If you checked UNCERTAIN or INEFFECTIVE for question 8, what do you consider to be the major reason for this? *(Check only one)*

_____ 1. It is an inflexible evaluation system, not allowing room for individual interests
_____ 2. It does not provide an effective mechanism to measure competence and incompetence
_____ 3. It pays only lip service to faculty development, i.e., there is not institutional commitment of resources to help faculty improve or grow professionally
_____ 4. Evaluators are not adequately trained
_____ 5. Poor instructors are not placed on warning or released
_____ 6. Other *(please specify)* _____
_____

10. What is actually done with the data generated by the post-tenure evaluation process at your institution? *(Check one only)*

_____ 1. Post-tenure evaluation is shared with evaluated faculty member and a plan for improvement and/or professional growth is established and supported by institutional resources
_____ 2. Post-tenure evaluation is shared with evaluated faculty member and the evaluated faculty member is left to his/her own devices to correct any weaknesses or deficiencies
_____ 3. Post-tenure evaluation is not shared with evaluated faculty member; information is used by administration to make personnel decisions
_____ 4. Post-tenure evaluation is not shared with evaluated faculty member; no follow up or institutional use is apparent
_____ 5. Other *(please specify)* _____
_____

11. Who within your institution formally participates in the evaluation of tenured faculty? *(Check all that apply)*

_____ 1. Student evaluations only
_____ 2. Peer evaluation (faculty evaluating faculty)
_____ 3. Faculty evaluated by administrative supervisors (division chairs and/or dean of instruction)
_____ 4. Student and peer combination
_____ 5. Student and administrative combination
_____ 6. Peer and administrative combination
_____ 7. Student, peer and administrative combination

12. In general, how beneficial to you has the evaluation system been at your institution in terms of your professional development?

_____ 1. Very beneficial
_____ 2. Beneficial
_____ 3. Detrimental
_____ 4. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

13. Which of the following do you regard as problems associated with *post-tenure* evaluation at your institution? *(Check all that apply)*

_____ 1. No problems; the post-tenure evaluation system works effectively
_____ 2. Excessive paperwork
_____ 3. Faculty resistance
_____ 4. Ineffective implementation of faculty development plan to complement post-tenure evaluation
_____ 5. Lack of a significant reward system for outstanding performance
_____ 6. Evaluators are not adequately trained
_____ 7. Other *(please specify)* _____

_____

14. Has there been a change in your college's priority for faculty evaluation during the past two years?

_____ 1. Yes *(if yes, state what the change has been)* _____

_____

_____ No _____

15. If you could change the post-tenure evaluation plan at your institution, what changes would you make?

_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 2: OPINIONS REGARDING POST-TENURE EVALUATION
Directions: Please read each of the following statements. Using the scale below, circle the letters that most closely reflect your reaction to each statement:
SD - Strongly Disagree / D - Disagree / A - Agree / SA - Strongly Agree

1.	There should be periodic post-tenure evaluation for tenured faculty to assess level of performance and developmental needs.	SD	D	A	SA
2.	Tenured faculty should welcome periodic assessment of their overall performance.	SD	D	A	SA
3.	There should be a faculty development program implemented in conjunction with the post-tenure evaluation plan.	SD	D	A	SA
4.	Only instructional administrators should evaluate tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
5.	Only tenured colleagues should evaluate tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
6.	There should be multiple sources of input to post-tenure evaluation including: administrators, peers, students and self.	SD	D	A	SA
7.	The criteria used to evaluate tenured faculty should differ from criteria used to evaluate non-tenured faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
8.	Post-tenure evaluation increases the likelihood of faculty growth and vitality.	SD	D	A	SA
9.	Post-tenure evaluation leads to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
10.	Post-tenure evaluation should lead to the weeding out of incompetent faculty.	SD	D	A	SA
11.	Growth contracts (i.e., individual work plans mutually agreed upon between faculty and supervisor) should be the primary basis for evaluation of tenured faculty in community colleges.	SD	D	A	SA
12.	By the year 2000, traditional tenure will no longer exist in the majority of community colleges in the United States.	SD	D	A	SA

PART 3: CRITERIA UTILIZED IN POST-TENURE EVALUATION
Directions: Listed below are 19 criteria normally used in faculty evaluation.
a) If you currently have a post-tenure evaluation process at your institution, follow Steps 1, 2, and 3.
b) If you currently do NOT have a post-tenure evaluation process at your institution, DO NOT COMPLETE this part of the questionnaire.

STEP 1
Check (✓) each criterion currently used in post-tenure evaluation at your institution. Add any criterion to the list in the space provided at the bottom.

STEP 2
For each criterion you checked in Step 1, use the following number scale to indicate the amount of influence it carries. Put the appropriate number in the space provided below.

1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

Minor influence — Moderate influence — Major influence

STEP 3
Check (✓) the five criteria you would prefer to be the most influential in post-tenure evaluation at your institution

____	1. Classroom Effectiveness	____	____
____	2. Advising Students	____	____
____	3. Campus Committee Work	____	____
____	4. Personality	____	____
____	5. Research	____	____
____	6. Activity in Local, State or National Professional Society	____	____
____	7. Publication	____	____
____	8. Public or Community Service Activities	____	____
____	9. Consultation in Field	____	____
____	10. Competing Job Offers	____	____
____	11. Availability to Students Outside of Required Office Hours	____	____
____	12. Contributions to Department/Division	____	____
____	13. Course or Curriculum Development	____	____
____	14. Innovation in Teaching Methods and Materials	____	____
____	15. Attendance and Reliability	____	____
____	16. Accumulation of Graduate Credits	____	____
____	17. Working Toward Doctorate	____	____
____	18. Teaching Community Service or Off-Campus Courses	____	____
____	19. Personal Life Style	____	____
OTHER:			
____	20. _____	____	____
____	21. _____	____	____
____	22. _____	____	____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the attached self addressed envelope

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges MAR 10 1989

Licata,C -1638